

SUMMARY OF TEXT REVISIONS RECOMMENDED

Following is a summary of the revisions recommended by the staff in the July 23 memo. This reflects only those items where substantive changes are proposed. Items that are not recommended for change are not listed. The recommended changes are summarized below:

1. Add some clarifying language to the definitions of both Dwelling Unit and Kitchen (Pierzchala memo nos. 2e, 2h, 2ee).
2. The staff recommends eliminating the height waiver for senior housing (Sec. 25.15.02.j) in the smaller lot zones but retaining it for the larger lot zones that would have more land to accommodate increased setbacks (Pierzchala memo nos. 25, 36, 49).
3. The staff makes the following recommendations on the project review process (Pierzchala memo no. 21):

Simplify the process for certain minor amendments

Review the Project Impact Points table and consider revising the point requirements and simplifying the number of project review levels

Revise the findings for a project plan

4. Revisiting certain institutional uses (hospitals, private schools, senior housing, etc.) and temporary uses in the single-family zones to determine if they are conducive to large lot zones or any single-family zones, and revisiting where a height waiver is allowed (Pierzchala memo nos. 25, 36, 49).
- .
5. Adding photos or additional graphics for certain items will also be examined.
6. The staff recommends that Sec. 25.05.07.b.5 be revisited to clarify what constitutes a minor amendment and what the process should be (Pierzchala memo no. 9).
7. For lower-point applications consider simplifying the process for small-scale projects. For example, the Mayor and Council may want to consider eliminating the second area meeting, or changing the Planning Commission's role to opine on the Master Plan compliance so it is at the request of the Board of Appeals if they desire (Pierzchala memo no. 21 re: Sec. 25.07.09).
- .
8. Signs: As has been mentioned in the past, the Sign Provisions need a thorough study and update. This is a substantial work program item for a future year and probably warrants a budget for consultant assistance. We can do piecemeal ZTA's if deemed necessary and desirable to address specific issues (Pierzchala memo no. 54).

9. Except as noted below, the staff supports the numerous changes to the text for the technical corrections and clarifications as noted in the memo on pages B-7 to B-20.
10. In addition to these specific items identified by Mr. Pierzchala, the staff has noted some additional minor technical and typographic errors that should be corrected. These will be included in any text amendment that could result from a worksession.
11. Improvements to the Review Process

In addition to the items above, the staff has reviewed the experiences of the first year of the new ordinance along with the recommendations of the Communications Task Force and Councilmember Pierzchala's memo. While we do not recommend designing the process for the worst projects or the applicant that does not want to cooperate, there are changes that could improve some of the primary criticisms of the current code.

The intent of these steps would be to insure that the pre-application area meeting is conducted sufficiently in advance of the DRC and the application submission, and that these meetings are attended by staff, and that minutes are taken by an objective source.

In addition, it increases public education and resources to become more effective participants in the process. Additional details and code amendments would be required if the Mayor and Council are interested in such changes, with the concept including the following changes:

1. The Pre-application Area Meeting must occur prior to the Pre-application DRC Meeting.
2. The Post-application Area Meeting is attended by City staff to answer questions but is conducted by the applicant.
3. Minutes of all Area Meetings are taken by an objective outside source and paid for by the applicant.
4. The notice of filing should include the date of the DRC meeting.
5. Notices should include: the brochure (already implemented), information on the Planning Academy, anticipated timeline, location map, site plan if appropriate, and a brief project description (i.e. 3-4 pages).